

REMARKS

The Final Office Action issued by the Examiner dated May 28, 2008 and the citations referred to in the office action have been carefully considered. Applicant submits a Request for Continued Examination with this Response. Claims 26-35 are pending in this patent application. In this Response, Applicant has amended claim 26. Claim 26 is amended solely for clarification purposes and not for any reason related to patentability. No new matter is added with the amendment to claim 26.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 26-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “The TraceJava User’s Guide” by Brian Marick (“Marick”) in view of US Patent No. 5,642,478 to Chen (“Chen”).

With respect to amended claim 26, Applicant has clarified the utilization of the trap value: “writing each remaining trace record stored in the trace history buffer to the log file if at (i) least one of the trace records is written to the log file as the logged trace record and (ii) a trap value specific to a process from a plurality of processes in the program activity is detected within the logged trace record.” If a particular trace record had a trace level that exceeded the predetermined threshold, then that particular trace record is written to a log file. At that point, only that particular trace record is written to the log file. The occurrence of that particular trace record being written to the log file invokes a determination as to whether a trap value exists in that particular trace record written to the log file. If such a trap value exists, then each of the remaining trace records in the trace history buffer is then also written to the log file.

The combination of Marick and Chen simply does not teach “writing each remaining trace record stored in the trace history buffer to the log file if (i) at least one of the trace records is written to the log file as the logged trace record and (ii) a trap value specific to a process from a plurality of processes in the program activity is detected within the logged trace record.” Marick does not teach that a particular trace record is written to a log file, and based on a trap

value within that specific trace record, the remaining trace records are written to the log file. According to claim 1, each of the remaining trace records in the history buffer may not be written to the log file if the trap value is not detected in the trace record that is written to the log file. On the contrary Marick clearly states that it is concerned without how the entire buffer is written to the log file: “How is the transient buffer dumped to the log?” See Marick, page 10. One of the possibilities that Marick identifies for writing the buffer to the log file is an exception handler. See Marick, page 10. However, Marick does not teach that the exception handler looks at a file that has already been written to the log file to determine if a trap value is present so that the remaining trace records are also written to the log file.

Further, the combination of Marick and Chen does not teach “a trap value specific to a process from a plurality of processes in the program activity.” The Final Office Action states that “[i]n Marick, the exception is indeed specific to monitored program activity. The monitored program activity is the source of the exception.” See Final Office Action, page 2. Under this particular interpretation of Marick, the exception handler is specific to the monitored program activity as a whole, not to a specific process from a plurality of process in that monitored program activity. In other words, the processes not having the trap value according to amended claim 1 are ignored whereas such processes may still trigger a writing to the log file in Marick if an exception is encountered. Therefore, Marick does not teach the “trap value” as recited in amended claim 1.

In addition, the combination of Marick and Chen does not teach “writing, after the collecting the trace data reaches a predetermined point, the trace data to one or more trace records in a trace history buffer located in a volatile memory” as recited by amended claim 1. In other words, amended claim 1 does not immediately start writing the trace data to trace records in the trace history buffer. After a certain predetermined point of collecting the trace data, trace data is written to one or more trace records. Marick appears to begin writing trace data to trace records as trace data is obtained. Accordingly, the combination of Marick and Chen does not teach a predetermined point.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Further, claims 27-35 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejections of claims 27-35 should also be withdrawn. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's undersigned representative, Samuel K. Simpson at **(310) 496-4255** to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in a condition for allowance.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s), or to credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account Number 09-0460**. Please ensure that Attorney Docket Number CA920030064US1/IBM-0220 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "M.K. Simpson", is written over a light gray rectangular background.

Date: July 17, 2008

Samuel K. Simpson
Reg. No. 53,596

Customer Number 65814
PATENT INGENUITY, P.C.
520 Broadway, Suite 350
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Phone: (310) 496-4255
Fax: (310) 564-0454
E-mail: patents@patentingenuity.com